DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 389 463 PS 023 849

AUTHOR Whitebook, Marcy
TITLE Salary Improvements in Head Start: Lessons for the Early Care and Education Field.
INSTITUTION National Center for the Early Childhood Work Force, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 95
NOTE 73p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Center for the Early Childhood Work Force, 733 15th Street, N.W., Suite 1037, Washington, DC 20005 ($10, plus $3.75 shipping and handling).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Early Childhood Education; Educational Policy; *Federal Programs; Financial Support; Guidelines; *Preschool Education; *Program Implementation; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Salaries
IDENTIFIERS Head Start Improvement Act 1992; *Project Head Start; *Salary Enhancement

ABSTRACT

This report examines how Head Start programs have implemented teacher salary increases mandated and funded by the 1990 Head Start Expansion and Quality Improvement Act. It is based on quantitative data found in local grantees' and delegate agencies' reports to the Head Start Bureau on salaries and related questions, as well as qualitative data gathered from meetings with Head Start personnel. The report found that programs paying the lowest wages for each job category in 1992 reported the largest increases between 1992 and 1994, and that significant salary differences for each job category exist among programs. It also found that the educational level of Head Start teachers increased between 1992 and 1994, and that turnover rates remained relatively constant over the same period. The report recommends increased funding for the salary improvement project, improved salary data collection and dissemination, management training for program administrators to help them better implement the program, and improved program guidelines. Three appendices provide information on data sources, salary tables, and a list of the national Head Start regions. Contains 17 references. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 389 463

Salary Improvements

for

Head Start

Lessons for the Early Care and Education Field

PS 023849

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. E. Wayne
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

National Center for the Early Childhood Work Force

Salary Improvements in Head Start

Lessons for the Early Care and Education Field

AUTHOR

Marcy Whitebook

National Center for the Early Childhood Work Force

■

QUANTITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

Andrew Galdurgis

Belavin Research Institute

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many staff members of the National Center for the Early Childhood Work Force contributed to the preparation of this report: Claudia Wayne, Dan Bellm, Alice Burton, Kendra Wright, Cathy Davis and Beverly Sellers. This report also reflects the contributions of Pelavin Research Institute staff, Andrew Gaidurgis, John Cohen and Lorelei Bush, and National Head Start Association staff, Greg Powell, Sarah Green, Linda Likens and Towley Mailer.

We would also like to acknowledge the important feedback we received on drafts of this report from Coleen Mendel, Deborah Phillips and Greg Powell.

The following individuals participated in interviews, meetings and/or phone consultations, and provided invaluable insight into the Head Start salary enhancement process. Many other individuals contributed to this report, but have requested anonymity. We appreciate their feedback as well. Carolyn Atherly, Ann Bagge, Carol Baker, Don Bolce, Deborah Ceglowski, Terry Cower, Hal DeArmond, Linda Devin-Sheehan, Alice Dillon, Alice Walker Duff, Bill Ewing, Yolanda Garcia, Marilyn Giese, Sarah Greene, Joy Griffin, Mary Anne Hagan, Kory Paul-Hensley, Eleanor Hodson, Anna Jackette, Carrie Kenyon, Carmen Lieurance, Mary Ann Massenburg, Jackie Middleton, Ann Mitchell, Dennis Mulligin, Jo Navarro, Leslie Remach, Manuela Rendon, Susan Rorgbough, Ernestine Smith, Verna Thompson, Nell Watson, Judy Witeen, Dollie Wolverton.

This study was funded by a grant from the Ford Foundation. The Ford Foundation does not take responsibility for any statements or views expressed in the report.

Copyright © 1995 by the National Center for the Early Childhood Work Force
733 15th Street, N.W., Suite 1037, Washington, D.C. 20005-2112
(202) 737-7700 TEL ■ (202) 737-0370 FAX

Salary Improvements in Head Start

Lessons for the Early Care and Education Field

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. STUDY DESIGN 3

- ❖ Quantitative Salary and Program Characteristics Data 3
- ❖ Key Informant Data 4

III. TRENDS IN HEAD START SALARIES
1991 through 1994: Findings from Program Reports 7

- ❖ Background 7
- ❖ Data Limitations 8
- ❖ Findings 10

IV. IMPLEMENTING SALARY IMPROVEMENTS
Stories from the Head Start Community 15

- ❖ Introduction 15
- ❖ Challenge One
  Salary Increases and Values: Deciding the Basis for Financial Reward 18
- ❖ Challenge Two
  Structural Features of Head Start Programs that Impact
  the Implementation of Salary Improvements 23
- ❖ Challenge Three
  The Design of the Quality Improvement Initiative
  and it's Impact on Implementation 28

V. RECOMMENDATIONS 33

VI. CONCLUSION 39

APPENDIX 1: Data Sources 41

APPENDIX 2: Salary Tables 43

APPENDIX 3: Head Start Regions 63

REFERENCES 65

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In passing the 1990 Head Start Expansion and Quality Improvement Act, Congress acknowledged the critical role that staff training and compensation play in determining the quality of Head Start services. Reauthorized in 1994, the legislation has led to the allocation of some $470 million in salary increases for approximately 100,000 Head Start personnel--an average per-employee increase of about $1,500 per year from 1991 through 1994.

This report examines how the salary increases were implemented across and within different Head Start agencies, and identifies features of the plan -- and of the structure of Head Start agencies -- that either helped or hindered the salary improvement effort. It draws upon two major sources of information. The first is the quantitative data found in local grantees' and delegate agencies' reports to the Head Start Bureau on salaries and related questions, which were analyzed to assess salary improvements for different staff positions across program types and regions of the country. The second is qualitative data gathered from meetings with Head Start personnel, revealing staff views about program conditions and practices that either supported or impeded progress in increasing salaries in Head Start.

Trends in Head Start Salaries 1991-1994: Findings from Program Reports

Finding 1 ■ *Programs paying the lowest wages for each job category in 1992 reported the largest increases between 1992 and 1994.* As a result, the gap between the lowest and highest average salaries for each position has decreased slightly.

Finding 2 ■ *Despite recent salary increases, significant salary differences for each job category exist among programs operating under different auspices. Salaries also vary by region and size of program.* After two years of salary increases, programs operated by school systems pay the highest salaries for all but two positions. Programs operated by nonprofit agencies pay the second highest average salaries for each job category, and tribal programs pay the lowest. Larger programs tend to pay higher wages for all program positions.

Finding 3 ■ *Higher levels of formal education are associated with higher salaries for all staff positions in 1992 and in each subsequent year.*[1] Educational levels account for greater differences in salary within job categories than do region or auspices.

Finding 4 ■ *The average Head Start worker represented in this study is more highly educated than the average male or female in the overall civilian labor force. Yet for most job categories and educational levels, Head Start workers still earn substantially less than those with similar levels of education.* Head Start teachers with college degrees and the longest tenure, for example, earned an average of $18,642 per year, while the average male and female worker in the civilian labor force with a high school diploma earns $26,280 and $19,168 respectively.

Finding 5 ■ *The overall compensation package for Head Start employees increased between 1992 and 1993.* Salary increases were accompanied during this year by increases in overall dollars spent on health, dental, life and retirement benefits.

Finding 6 ■ *Compensation increases for social services, parent involvement and health coordinators were accompanied between 1990 and 1994 by decreases in overall departmental caseloads.* Although the average numbers of staff per coordinator increased, these staff are now responsible for fewer children and/or families. Caseloads for home visitors and classroom teaching staff remained constant, and those of education coordinators increased during this period.

Finding 7 ■ *Turnover rates among Head Start teachers, teacher assistants and home visitors remained relatively constant through 1994.* Turnover averaged 12.5 percent for teachers and 21 percent for assistants in 1994, considerably lower than the 43 percent rate recently reported for child care teaching staff (Cost, Quality and Child Outcomes Study Team, 1995) and considerably higher than 6.7 percent among K-12 teachers (National Center for Education Statistics, 1992).[2]

Finding 8 ■ *Levels of education and training for Head Start teaching staff increased between 1992 and 1994. Programs employing better-educated and better-compensated teaching staff were also more likely to comply with program performance standards.* The data reveal a trend between 1988 and 1994 toward employing teaching and home visiting staff with greater education and training.

---

1 The one exception is the small number of teacher aides who have completed some formal graduate-level education, which may not be required for their position; these earn less than their counterparts with Bachelor's degrees, but more than their colleagues with high school only or some college edcucation.

2 The available data do not differentiate new staff hires resulting from departures or promotions. There is also no information about staff who left their jobs because they were unwilling or unable to meet the Child Development Associate requirements for their position.

This suggests that improvements in compensation were paralleled by improved training for staff in many agencies.

Implementing Salary Improvements: Stories from the Head Start Community

Our discussions with Head Start employees generally reflected the above findings quite closely. Many, including some who had the found the implementation process difficult, spoke positively about the effects of the funds on staff morale, and on the recruitment and retention of qualified staff. Even those who were most favorable, however, generally expressed the need for additional funds to address the compensation problem in Head Start. With the exception of a few agencies, most of them housed within school districts, Head Start programs continue to fall far behind local school district salary scales for comparable positions. Many staff believe that reversing the cumulative effects of low pay for Head Start personnel will require a more substantial long-term investment, beyond the considerable commitment made to date by the federal government.

Certain challenges also surfaced in our discussions with the Head Start community. These included:

Deciding the Basis for Financial Reward

The availability of new funds compelled each agency to struggle with its own philosophy about different staff positions, as well as its relationship with the community. There were three major questions:

- Should raises be distributed equally across all positions, or targeted toward specific job titles?
- What should be the balance of rewards for length of service, job performance, and education and training?
- How can a Head Start agency balance its roles as a program offering services to people living in poverty, and as an employer providing jobs and opportunities that help bring an end to poverty?

The specific positions which agencies took about these issues appear to be less important than the process by which decisions were made. Directors who spoke most positively to us about the salary improvement initiative were those who greeted it as an opportunity to think about and clarify compensation issues within their organization; their leadership styles and their skills at fostering dialogue were critical. Similarly, staff viewed the improvements more positively in agencies where clear rationales for increases were given, and especially when they were involved

in the planning discussions themselves. Staff were understandably more disgruntled if they were unsure about how the funds were allocated or why certain decisions were made.

Structural Features of Head Start Programs.

Programs relying on *multiple funding streams* faced a particular predicament when they received salary enhancement funds from the federal government but not from their other sources of support. They had several choices: distribute the new federal dollars across the entire program, find additional money to cover raises for staff members funded through non-federal sources, and/or serve fewer children with state or local dollars because their costs per child rose when salaries were increased. In some cases, these complications led programs to turn back the salary improvement funds or to seek (usually without success) to use the funds for other purposes. Other informants, however, reported that the infusion of federal dollars helped them leverage salary increases from other funders.

In addition, most Head Start grantees are *multi-purpose, multi-delegate agencies* in which Head Start co-exists under the same governance structure as Weatherization, the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) Program, and/or other early childhood programs. Deserving as they are, however, the staff of these other programs were ineligible for the Head Start federal salary enhancement funds. Informants spoke of Head Start staff sometimes being viewed as the "haves" among the "have nots." In some cases, management returned the funds to the Head Start Bureau, for fear of worsening an imbalance among the staff of various programs or of disrupting their agency-wide salary schedule. But others saw the Head Start funds as a first step toward raising salaries for all staff, not as a threat to agency cohesion. When a director was skilled in team building, conflict resolution and regulation and had a certain level of political savvy, it was less likely that the funds would be turned back.

The Design of the Quality Improvement Initiative

While Head Start personnel appreciated the quality improvement set-aside, informants reported that the overall design of the initiative lacked uniform guidelines for defining and targeting salaries. Agencies set salary goals differently depending on which labor market was selected as a relevant point of comparison. Comparison groups selected included Head Start programs, other child care or early care and education programs, and public school child care or elementary programs. Some focused on other programs in their immediate vicinity, while others looked to county or regional programs for comparison.

Head Start programs also employed different strategies for collecting salary data. Some compared only starting wages, while other compared average wages for each position. Some directors received assistance from regional offices

or consultants, but most Head Start directors, who do not tend as a group to be skilled in survey methods, were left to their own devices to gather information.

Recommendations

Based on the study findings, our overall recommendations for the continuation of Head Start's salary enhancement initiative are the following:

- Increase the funds available for salary improvements in Head Start and other early care and education programs in order to upgrade program quality and create long-term career opportunities working with young children.

- Provide management training for Head Start directors and leadership development for other staff.

- Formulate recommended salary and career development guidelines for all Head Start positions, and provide assistance to programs which demonstrate minimal progress toward reaching them.

- Improve salary data collection and dissemination.

Head Start has significantly contributed to our national well-being by helping poor children enter school ready to learn, and by helping their parents develop skills for economic self-sufficiency. Head Start programs have also created important job opportunities, especially for people living in poverty. The capacity of Head Start to continue to deliver on its potential will depend on maintaining a skilled and stable work force, and the key to such staff stability is better compensation. The Head Start Expansion and Quality Improvement Act is a groundbreaking step in the right direction--one that must be continued and improved upon, and one that can inspire and guide compensation efforts elsewhere in the early care and education field.

I. INTRODUCTION

The presence of a skilled and consistent staff is a prerequisite for high quality in child development programs. Yet the low wages endemic to the early care and education field run counter to the recruitment and retention of a qualified and stable work force in Head Start and other early childhood services (Cost, Quality and Outcomes Team, 1995; U.S. General Accounting Office, 1994; Whitebook, Howes and Phillips, 1990). Studies establishing the relationship between salaries, program quality and positive outcomes for children echo the concerns of teachers, administrators and other program staff about the negative impact of low salaries and the critical need for effective salary improvement strategies (Cost, Quality and Outcome Teams, 1995; Schweinhart, Barnes and Weikert, 1993; Whitebook, Howes and Phillips, 1990). There is a growing consensus that compensation should be improved across all types of early childhood programs, yet there is little agreement about how this can be accomplished (Bellm, 1994; Boyer, 1990; Bellm and Whitebook, 1991).

During the past decade, a number of salary enhancement initiatives have been implemented at the state and federal levels. Among the most ambitious is the program established by Congress in the 1990 Head Start Expansion and Quality Improvement Act. This legislation provided funds both to increase the number of children served in Head Start and to upgrade the quality of program services by investing substantially in staff salaries. Not less than one-half of the amount reserved for quality improvements (25 per cent of any increase above previous funding levels) was explicitly reserved "to improve the compensation (including benefits) of staff of Head Start agencies and thereby enhance recruitment and retention of such staff." The remaining quality improvements funds were targeted for staff training, the hiring of additional staff, transportation, and non-structural improvements to facilities. The legislation also provided for an annual cost-of-living increase to programs, distinct from the quality improvements funds. The reauthorization of this legislation in 1994 maintained, with minor adjustments, the same quality provisions linked to expansion funds.

This report examines the compensation provisions of the 1990 Head Start Expansion and Quality Improvement Act. It reviews improvements in compensation for Head Start personnel as a result of targeted salary funds and

identifies features of the initiative--and of the structure of Head Start agencies--that facilitated or hindered salary improvement efforts. Finally, it identifies recommendations for improving future salary enhancement policy for Head Start, as well as lessons and implications for salary improvement initiatives elsewhere in the field. Many early care and education advocates and policy makers have looked to the Head Start quality improvement set-aside as a model for improving compensation in their services, and have sought a realistic appraisal of this Head Start effort's strengths and limitations.

II. STUDY DESIGN

Two sources of information were used to evaluate the implementation of the salary enhancement provisions of the 1990 Head Start Expansion and Quality Improvement Act. The first consisted of existing salary and related quantitative data generated from Head Start program reports to the Head Start Bureau. These data were analyzed to assess improvements in salaries for different staff positions across program types and regions of the country. Third, information was gathered through a series of meetings with Head Start personnel. These qualitative data were compiled and synthesized to shed light on conditions and practices, as identified by those directly involved in providing services, which supported or impeded the implementation of salary increases for Head Start staff.

❖ Quantitative Salary and Program Characteristics Data

Because of the multitude of state and federal funding and regulatory systems which affect programs serving young children, there has been a serious lack of coordination with regard to data collection on key program features. In addition, data collected on the early care and education work force in the United States is generally scant and is frequently difficult, if not impossible, to interpret accurately (Phillips and Whitebook, 1986). Data are not routinely collected on such critical program quality indicators as staff educational background, turnover and wages. The categories for staff and program type employed in data collection often mask or distort the actual operating structure of many programs, making it difficult to track the impact of policy initiatives. All Head Start programs, on the other hand, regardless of local regulations governing children's services, operate under the same requirements and receive the majority of their funds from one source: the federal government. As a result, data collection, while problematic, has been better-coordinated in this sector of the early care and education field than in others.

The Head Start Bureau oversees the administration of local Head Start programs, primarily through its regional offices. The Bureau resides within the Administration for Children, Youth and Families in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and works closely with regional federal offices on data collection and other coordination functions. The Bureau has made a concerted effort to develop a data infrastructure for Head Start programs. It maintains three primary sources of data about Head Start grantees and delegate agencies, namely Program Information Reports, Head Start Cost Reports, and Head Start Monitoring and Tracking Reports. (See Appendix 1 for full descriptions.) These data are collected annually and entered into the Department of Health and Human Services mainframe computer in Baltimore, Maryland. Regional Head

Start offices have access to this information. The Head Start Bureau granted permission to the National Center for the Early Childhood Work Force to examine these data, in collaboration with the Pelavin Research Institute, for the purpose of determining changes in salaries following the implementation of the 1990 Head Start Expansion and Quality Improvement Act.

Analysis Plan

We initially assumed that the Program Information Report (PIR) data would provide comprehensive information about changes in salaries. Gaps in the available data, however, required adaptations to the original design. The PIR data were analyzed to provide information about changes in salaries from 1992 through 1994. Head Start Cost Reports (HSCOST) data were also analyzed for information about benefits which is not included in the PIR data. Finally, Head Start Monitoring and Tracking Reports, which use the On-Site Program Review Instrument (OSPRI), were enlisted to explore the relationship between compliance with performance standards and improvements in salaries.

❖ Key Informant Data

In order to gain a deeper understanding of barriers and successes experienced by programs as they implemented salary increases, we also sought perspectives about the salary funds from various stakeholders in the Head Start community. Working in collaboration with the National Head Start Association, we planned a series of meetings with key informants.

First, five telephone conference-call meetings, each lasting approximately one and a half hours, were arranged. These focused on the experiences of administrators and staff from different Head Start auspices or program types, including school board, community action, limited purpose, migrant and Indian grantees. Participants in these meetings were identified and contacted by staff of the National Head Start Association.

Second, a plenary session of the National Head Start Association Presidents' meeting in October 1994 was devoted to a discussion of salary improvement issues, and was followed by several small group discussions with attendees. The National Head Start Association Presidents meeting draws participants from all types of programs in every region of the country. Over 200 people attended the general meeting on salary enhancement.

Third, a session at the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Conference in November 1994 was devoted to the topic. Approximately 50 people attended, including a large proportion of non-administrative staff, and were asked to share their experiences regarding salary improvement efforts.

Finally, we conducted approximately 25 telephone interviews with individuals closely tied to Head Start programs either as teaching staff, administrators or advocates. Most of these interviews were generated from suggestions made during the conference calls and at the meetings.

Discussion guides were developed and distributed in advance for those participating in the conference calls and National Head Start Association Presidents' meeting. Written transcripts were prepared from the conference calls and the Presidents' meeting, and were synthesized with other interview data to generate the findings reported in Section IV.

III. TRENDS IN HEAD START SALARIES 1991 through 1994: Findings from Program Reports

❖ Background

In drafting the 1990 Head Start Expansion and Quality Improvement Act, lawmakers acknowledged the significant role which Head Start staff play in determining the caliber of services. Since the passage of the Act in 1990 and its reauthorization in 1994, about $470 million has been allocated to increase salaries for the approximately 100,000 Head Start personnel.

A survey conducted by the National Head Start Association, following the first year of implementation of the 1990 legislation, documented an average increase of 7.2 percent in salaries for personnel represented in their sample of 314 Head Start programs (National Head Start Association, 1993). A recently released study by the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) indicated that quality set-aside funds were used primarily during 1992-1993 to improve the salaries and benefits of Head Start staff. Many programs spent more than half of their quality set-aside funds for salaries. The 870 Head Start grantees and delegate agencies represented in the GAO sample reported using, on average, 58 percent of their total quality funds either for salary increases or for fringe benefits: specifically, 41 percent for salary increases and 17 percent for improving or providing new fringe benefits (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1994).

In this report, we focus on questions left unanswered by previous studies regarding how salary increases have been implemented across and within different Head Start agencies. Specifically, we examine to what extent:

- Salary enhancement dollars have equalized salaries across different *types* of Head Start programs. That is, did programs paying lower salaries to their staff implement greater increases than those already paying higher salaries? Did salary increases differ for small, medium and large grantees, or among different program auspices and geographical regions?

- Salaries have improved for different Head Start job *categories*. Were raises targeted to particular job categories, to staff who achieve certain levels of education or training, or to staff who have attained greater tenure in the agency?

- Salary increases have raised Head Start salaries to a level comparable to those paid for positions requiring similar education and training in the overall civilian labor force.

- Compensation for Head Start personnel has also changed through the addition of *fringe benefits* and/or *increases in hours of employment*.

- Salary increases have been linked to such changes associated with quality improvements as increased training levels, reduced caseloads, and lower turnover rates for Head Start personnel.

❖ Data Limitations

The Program Information Reports and other available Head Start data provide partial answers to the above questions. Serious problems in the PIR instrument and methodology, however, limit a more comprehensive analysis. Among the most problematic aspects of the PIR data set are the following:

- *There are no baseline salary data for 1991, the year immediately preceding the receipt of salary enhancement funds.* Historically, certain questions in the PIRs were rotated every one to three years. Salary questions were among those rotated and were not included in the 1991 PIR questionnaire. Available PIR data provide only information about changes in salaries between 1992 and 1994. (Since 1992, salary questions have been permanently incorporated into the PIR request forms.)

- *There are no aggregate data for some staff positions, and certain staff positions are not included in the PIR.* Although there is salary and educational data for all component coordinators and directors, such data on teachers and teacher aides are requested only for the persons most recently hired and for those with the greatest tenure in any given agency. Some Head Start agencies have more than two levels of teaching staff, and these are not included in the PIR job categories. No salary data for home visitors are requested in the PIR. Combined positions in which an employee works as both a home visitor and aide, for example, are increasingly common among Head Start employees, but these are not captured by existing PIR categories.

- *No educational requirements, work load or responsibilities are identified for different job titles.* It is therefore possible that salary variations reflect, to some extent, differences in job qualifications and/or responsibilities in jobs with the same title in different programs. For example, a parent involvement coordinator in one agency may work with more families or supervise more staff than her counterpart in another agency.

- *There is no information about the length of the work day or work year.* Reported salaries, for example, could represent a 20-, 30- or 40-hour work week, or an eight-, nine-, 10- or 12-month work year. There is also some

confusion as to whether PIR data reported for a given year cover the same funding cycles, due to variations in the fiscal year among grantees.

- *Several staff tenure categories are excluded from the PIR survey.* The PIR asks for the number of staff who have worked in their current position for zero to one, two to five, six to 10, 11 to 15, or 16 or more years. There is no way to tell, for example, whether all staff who have been on the job for more than one but less than two years are classified in the same way by all respondents.

- *Staff turnover and advancement within the organization cannot be distinguished.* No differentiation is made in the data, for example, between whether an assistant was promoted to teacher or whether she left the program entirely. Changes in staffing due to program expansion are captured, however, because the PIR includes information about the number of new staff positions.

Not all programs submitted complete PIR reports for 1992, 1993 and 1994 for each staff position. In order to make accurate comparisons among years, we used in our analysis only data for grantees and delegates with records in all three years.[3] Because of the missing data, we can only present a descriptive analysis of the grantees and delegates for which we have complete data. The statistical analyses, therefore, are used to show relationships between data that are present and cannot be used to draw significance to the universe of Head Start programs.[4]

---

[3] Eighty-six percent of the 2,050 programs submitting PIR reports with director data in 1994, for example, also submitted reports in 1992 and 1993. Of these, 107 (5.2 percent) did not complete the salary data. An additional 48 programs appear to have pro-rated salaries by funding source, reporting only the portion of the salaries paid for by Head Start dollars--resulting in director salaries of less than $10,000 a year. These were eliminated from the sample, bringing the final sample size to 1,599 programs, or 78 percent of those submitting PIR data in 1994. For each staff position, a similar procedure was used to establish the final number of cases reported here. A lower salary cut-off, however, was used for teacher ($5,000) and teacher aide ($4,000) positions.

[4] The final table in Appendix 2 provides information about the number of programs by region and auspice providing PIR data for 1992, 1993 and 1994, the three years under consideration here. The total number of programs in the PIR for 1993 and 1994 are also included, providing information about the universe of Head Start programs in these years. Some programs excluded from the data set were probably not in existence in 1992, but specific information about non-respondents or selection bias is not available. The data set represents more than a 90 percent response rate.

Appendix 2 contains tables summarizing the findings on salaries and increases for each of the following staff positions:

Directors
Social Services Coordinators
Education Coordinators
Parent Involvement Coordinators
Health Coordinators
Most Tenured Teachers
Least Tenured Teachers
Most Tenured Assistants
Least Tenured Assistants

The tables include information for all regions and auspices combined, as well as a breakdown of salaries and increases by region, auspices, and salary and educational levels of staff. Data on training levels and the number of new staff hired each year for 1989 through 1994 are also included for teachers, assistants and home visitors. A list of states and territories included in each region is included in Appendix 3.

❖ Findings

Finding 1 • Programs paying the lowest wages for each job category in 1992 reported the largest increases in salaries between 1992 and 1994.

As indicated in the salary tables for each job category, salaries for those in the lowest income quartile among all programs increased by a greater percentage than salaries for those in the higher income quartiles. As a result, the gap between the lowest and highest average salaries for each position decreased slightly.

Finding 2 • Despite recent salary increases, significant salary differences for each job category exist among programs operating under different auspices. They also vary by region and size of program.

Tribal programs paid the lowest salaries for each job category. In 1992, after two years of salary increases, programs operated by school systems paid the highest salaries for each job category, with two exceptions: First, programs operated by nonprofit agencies paid the second highest average salaries for each job category and the highest for parent coordinators and teacher aides. Second, programs operated by government agencies paid, on average, higher salaries to teacher aides than did school systems, but less than did nonprofits.

There were no differences, however, between salaries paid by tribal programs, community action agencies or school systems to the least tenured teacher aides in 1992 through 1994. There were no differences by auspices in the size of salary increases for different job categories between 1992 and 1994.

Differences in salary by region are evident for each job category and for each year under investigation. Regions 1, 2 and 9 most frequently paid the highest salaries in any category, while Regions 8, 11 and 12 most frequently paid the lowest salaries. Larger programs paid higher wages for all program positions. Directors in the largest programs, for example, earned approximately $11.00 more per child than those managing the smallest programs.

Finding 3 • Higher levels of formal education are associated with higher salaries for all staff positions in 1992 and in each subsequent year. Educational levels account for greater differences in salaries within job categories than do region or auspices.

The one exception is the small number of teacher aides who have completed some formal graduate-level education, which probably is not required for their position; these earn less than their counterparts with Bachelor's degrees, but more than their colleagues with only high school or some college education.

Finding 4 • The average member of the Head Start work force represented in this study is more highly educated than the average male or female in the overall civilian labor force. Yet for most job categories and educational levels, Head Start workers earn substantially less than those with similar levels of education in other types of jobs.

In 1993, the year for which the most current data are available, for example, 19.2 percent of women and 24.8 percent of men in the overall civilian labor force had achieved a Bachelor's or higher degree, compared to approximately three-quarters of Head Start directors, education and social services coordinators, and two-fifths or more of teachers and parent involvement and health coordinators.[5] Approximately 50 percent of the most tenured teacher aides, and 38 percent of the least tenured, also had some college training--roughly equivalent to the 47 percent of men and 44 percent of women in the civilian labor force with some college training. The average earnings for women and men in the civilian labor force with a Bachelor's degree or higher in 1993 were $30,344 and $41,413 respectively. Within Head Start, however, only directors earned, on average, salaries comparable to or higher than the average female worker; other job categories were paid close

---

[5] Information about the types of degrees or college courses Head Start staff have completed is not available, nor is information about the educational requirements for each position in various programs. Thus, in some cases, Head Start staff may have completed college work unrelated to or not required for their current position.

to or considerably less than the average member of the female civilian labor force with similar levels of education. No job category in Head Start, including directors, met or exceeded the earning levels of males in the civilian work force. The most tenured teachers with college degrees earned on average $18,642 per year, while average female and male workers in the civilian labor force with a high school diploma earned $19,168 and $26,280, respectively.

Finding 5 • The overall compensation package for Head Start employees, including salaries and fringe benefits, increased between 1992 and 1993.

Based on figures from the HSCOST[6] reports for 341 programs which reported salaries and benefits for all personnel between 1992 and 1994, salary increases were accompanied by increases in overall dollars spent on health, dental, life and retirement benefits during those years. During this same period, 11 out of 25 programs (44 percent) in this sub-sample began offering health, dental and life insurance, and 46 out of 108 (43 percent) that had not previously offered retirement benefits began to do so.

The PIR does not include information about the length of program day. It is therefore not possible to determine whether changes in compensation levels reflect a longer work day for some staff positions. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this may have occurred in certain instances. No significant relationship between compensation levels and changes in the length of the program year, as reported in the PIR, was found in the sample.

---

6 This finding on benefits should be interpreted with caution, because it is based on less than a quarter of Head Start programs. No information on reasons for non-response is available.

Finding 6 • Compensation increases for social services, parent involvement and health coordinators were accompanied between 1990 and 1994 by decreases in overall caseloads in their components (i.e., departments).[7]

Although the average numbers of staff per coordinator increased, these staff were responsible for fewer children and/or families. Caseloads for home visitors and classroom teaching staff remained constant, and caseloads for education coordinators increased during this period. Based on figures from the HSCOST reports from 215 grantees who completed caseload information across all time periods under consideration, caseloads changed as shown below. Parent involvement, social services and health coordinators also received slightly higher percentage salary increases during this period.

Component	1990-91 Staff to Coordinator Ratio	1994-95 Staff to Coordinator Ratio	1990-91 Caseloads/ Class Size	1994-95 Caseload/ Class Size
Social Services	5.59:1	8.27:1	161	91
Parent Involvement	3.63:1	6.56:1	305	178
Health Services	3.40:1	3.20:1	258	228
Education	7.93:1	17.04:1	18.3	18.0
Home Based Services	5.40:1	6.49:1	11.2	11.1

[7] As with information on benefits, caseload information is based on a selected sample of respondents.

Finding 7 • Turnover rates among Head Start teachers, teacher assistants and home visitors, as reflected in PIR data, remained relatively constant for the years immediately prior to salary improvements through 1994[8]

Turnover rates averaged 12.5 percent for teachers and 21 percent for assistants in 1994, considerably lower than the 43 percent rate reported for child care center teaching staff and considerably higher than the 6.7 percent among K-12 teachers (Cost, Quality and Outcome Team, 1995; National Center for Education Statistics, 1992). Turnover rates among home visitors closely resembled those of teacher assistants, the two lowest-paid categories of Head Start staff. As indicated on page 61, turnover rates varied by region and auspices.[9]

Finding 8 • Higher levels of education were correlated with higher salaries for all positions, and, as in previous studies, programs employing better-educated and better-compensated teaching staff were more likely to comply with program performance standards as measured by the OSPRI.[10] **Levels of education and training for teaching staff increased between 1992 and 1994.**

Specifically, programs with a higher percentage of teachers with early childhood education degrees, and to a lesser extent those with more teachers who had earned their Child Development Associate (CDA) credentials, were scored higher by observers on the OSPRI observations.[11] There was also a trend toward programs employing teacher and home visitor staff with greater education and training between 1988 and 1994. This suggests that improved compensation has paralleled greater training for staff in many agencies.

---

8 As mentioned previously, the available data do not differentiate new staff hires resulting from departures or promotions. There is also no information about staff who left their jobs, because they were unwilling or unable to meet the Child Development Associate credential required for their positions.

9 Staff changes among teachers, assistants and home visitors exceeded turnover rates between 1991 and 1994, as programs also expanded personnel in these positions. On average, for example, fewer than three percent of new teachers were hired due to expansion in 1989 and 1990, compared to 10 percent in 1994.

10 In interpreting these findings, caution is urged because inter-rater reliability has not been established for the OSPRI measures.

11 Brush, Gaidurgis, and Best (1993) found a similar relationhip between salaries, education and performance standards.

IV. IMPLEMENTING SALARY IMPROVEMENTS
Stories from the Head Start Community

❖ Introduction

Informants with whom we spoke reflected many of the findings reported above in their stories of salary improvements at the community level.[12] Many, including some who found the process of implementation difficult, spoke positively about how the funds enabled them to:

- *Increase wages across job titles, permitting them to narrow the gap between the salaries they paid to staff and those paid by other types of early childhood programs.* Some stated that their agency had emerged as the best-paying early childhood program in their community, with the exception of programs operated by the public schools.

- *Improve benefits for personnel, either by expanding existing health or retirement policies, or by initiating either or both.* In some cases, programs expanded health coverage to a full calendar year even though staff worked for nine or 10 months only.

- *Extend work hours to full-day and/or full-year schedules which, when combined with salary increases, provided many employees with substantially higher annual income.* Several informants spoke of creating more full-time, higher-paying jobs by combining expansion funds, which permitted increased work hours, with funds earmarked for salary improvements.

> *I think the main thing that has helped is that staff realize how important we think they are to the program, and that the management team values them and shows it by giving raises.*
>
> • Head Start Director

- *Enhance morale among staff, even when raises were small, by acknowledging the inadequacy of current pay levels.* Some informants felt that the initial impact on morale was considerable, due in part to overall low expectations in the early childhood field for improved compensation and recognition; this

[12] There are some discrepancies between informant reports and data from the PIR. For example, informants reported a decrease in turnover while the PIR data indicated little change between 1992 and 1994. These discrepancies may reflect problems in the PIR previously described and/or in sample selection.

phenomenon has been noted in relation to other salary enhancement initiatives (Whitebook and Sakai, 1995). Directors also reported that permanent salary increases reduced or eliminated historical inequities between certain positions within their agencies, and that monetary rewards for tenure and/or professional preparation also contributed positively to staff morale.

- *Facilitate recruitment and retention of qualified staff, as a function of more competitive salary and benefit packages within the early childhood field.* Qualified personnel were somewhat more willing to accept employment at Head Start agencies that met or exceeded compensation levels of other early care and education programs. Our informants reported that staff left their agencies less frequently than before, in part because they had less to gain by transferring to another early childhood job.

These optimistic trends notwithstanding, even those Head Start personnel who successfully implemented or benefited from salary improvement funds expressed a need for more funds to address the salary crisis. With the exception of some Head Start agencies housed within school districts, and scattered agencies operating under other auspices, Head Start programs continue to fall far behind local school district salary scales for comparable positions. Many believe that reversing the cumulative effects of low pay for Head Start personnel will require a substantial long-term investment in salary upgrades, beyond the considerable commitment made to date by the federal government. This opinion was also expressed in the General Accounting Office (GAO) study which identified insufficient salaries as a primary barrier in recruiting qualified Head Start staff, even though the program had raised salaries significantly since the passage of the Head Start Expansion and Quality Improvement Act. Approximately half of the directors in the GAO study reported that salaries paid to their staff were lower than those paid for comparable positions in the community for every service area but nutrition, and particularly for education, social service and parent involvement staff (U.S. Government Accounting Office, 1994).

Our ability to compete for staff is beginning to show. Three years ago, if we got three people who were qualified for a teaching position, we were thrilled. Now we are actually having to screen and give some thought to who we want to hire, because we're starting to recruit more qualified people.

• Head Start Director

Beyond the need for greater salary supports, other issues surfaced in our discussions with members of the Head Start community with respect to the salary improvement funds. These ranged from frustrations expressed by directors about

increased health insurance premiums gobbling up funds for staff raises, to staff claims that raises were not fairly distributed, to situations in which programs turned down the funds because of administrative problems. In particular, Head Start programs which operate as part of larger community agencies often encountered resistance to their proposals to distribute salary funds to their staff, because the agencies did not have the funding to raise wages for all personnel.

Many did not anticipate the issues that arose around distribution of the salary funds. For the majority of managers and staff in early childhood programs, including Head Start personnel prior to the 1990 legislation, the primary obstacle to improving salaries lies in the absence of a source of dedicated funds for raises. "If only there were more money" is the common lament heard in the early childhood field, particularly in light of compelling demands to expand services for families and keep them affordable.

Mandated quality improvement funds provided the means for Head Start agencies to overcome this fundamental barrier to improving jobs and services. But once they became available, the funds posed three types of new challenges: 1) those centered on questions of philosophy which arise whenever decisions must be made about the allocation of funds for staff; 2) those that stem from the structure of particular Head Start agencies; and 3) those related to the design of the salary improvement policy.

Each of these challenges is discussed below.

❖ Challenge One
Salary Increases and Values: Deciding the Basis for Financial Reward

Most salary enhancement initiatives supported by public funds have issued detailed directives to recipients. A statewide initiative implemented in Massachusetts in the mid 1980s and the Caregiver Personnel Pay Plan implemented in Military Child Care programs within months of the Head Start policy both articulated salary goals tied to educational achievements for all staff in their respective systems. The Massachusetts plan was developed largely with input from many child care providers and advocates, including District 65, UAW, the union representing child care staff in many state-funded programs, while the Military Child Care program was designed primarily by military Child Development Services administrators.[13]

The National Head Start Association (NHSA) played a critical role in advocating for salary increases in the 1990 Head Start Expansion and Quality Improvement Act. NHSA is comprised of 15,000 individual members, including representatives of all Head Start program positions (including management and line staff) as well as parents. Throughout the previous decade, the NHSA raised concerns about low Head Start salaries and their impact on services in several critical reports (NHSA, 1990a; NHSA, 1990b). Neither NHSA advocates nor the policy makers who designed the Head Start salary provisions articulated a specific philosophy about how the dollars should be spent at the program level, other than ensuring that individual grantees would have autonomy and flexibility in making those decisions.

---

[13] For the majority of occupations, improvements in wages and other working conditions have followed historically from concerted organizing drives among recipients, sometimes in the form of collective bargaining efforts and/or campaigns to implement certification programs that lead to increased compensation. In the process of such drives and campaigns, advocates identify goals which represent their values about whom and what to reward, and articulate this philosophy in the form of demands to a management or funding agency. Through a process of negotiation, decisions are then made about how to spend existing or new revenues. In the absence of worker organizations, decisions about who will be rewarded are typically made solely by the management or policy body.

The limited raises that have occurred in early care and education workplaces have typically followed the latter format, except in those few work sites where staff have been organized. Fewer than five percent of workers in child care programs are covered by a collective bargaining agreement, and the professional organizations to which 14 percent of child care workers belong do not represent, by and large, the economic interests of their members at the workplace (Whitebook et al., 1990; Morin, 1992). While Head Start personnel are better organized than their child care counterparts, the majority (75 percent) do not work under a collective bargaining agreement or belong to a professional organization that represents them at their workplace, unlike almost all K-12 teachers in the public schools. Of interest about the Head Start initiative is that directors, through the National Head Start Association, played a greater advocacy role than line staff in securing the funds.

Whether the issues are debated during the design or the implementation stage, similar questions face those who decide how salary funds will be spent. For example: Should a wage floor be set? Should the raises be based on a system of merit or achievement, or on length of service? These questions are challenging when a new program is being established, but their resolution can be much more highly charged within an existing program and staff. This latter situation characterizes the climate in which decisions about salary increases were made in Head Start agencies following the passage of the 1990 Act. The availability of the funds compelled each agency to grapple with its own philosophy about different staff positions, as well as with its relationship with the community. The three major questions noted here are discussed in the following section.

Should raises be distributed equally across all positions, or targeted toward specific job titles?

There are a number of different job titles within Head Start, including teaching staff, home visitors, administrators or directors, janitors, cooks, and coordinators for education, social services, nutrition, parent involvement and health services. In most Head Start agencies, prior to the salary improvements, all job titles suffered from low wages as compared to similar jobs in the community. In some cases, the discrepancy between community and agency pay rates for a particular position was greater than in others. The positions considered most disadvantaged varied from agency to agency. Some decided to distribute the same level of salary increase across all positions, while others focused increases (or larger raises) on select positions, often rotating greater increases among different job titles each year. Decisions about percentage versus fixed-amount raises also had to be made. Fixed-amount raises (e.g., $500 per employee) were generally favored in agencies which were seeking to raise living standards equally for all employees. But fixed-amount raises narrow the gap between positions with different pay scales, resulting in a lower-percentage raise paid to employees earning the highest salaries. In some agencies this created considerable tension.

What should be the balance between rewards for length of service (tenure), quality of job performance (merit), and education and training (professional qualifications)?

A skilled and stable work force is essential to the success of Head Start and other early care and education programs. All of our informants were deeply committed to rewarding staff who had made a long-term commitment to the agency, often at great personal expense due to low wages.

Some staff and directors felt that salary increases should therefore favor long-tenured staff. At the same time, almost all informants, including many who favored rewarding tenure, bemoaned the fact that low salaries impeded the recruitment of qualified entry-level staff. Some chose to raise the floor for entry-level positions in order to attract applicants; unfortunately, they sometimes did so at the cost of creating tensions among staff. Those with many years of service ended up earning the same or only slightly more than new recruits. This issue was further complicated if tenured staff had less education or training than the new recruits, bringing the agencies' commitment to economic justice and professionalism into conflict.

Trade-offs also had to be made regarding tenure versus educational achievements or other qualifications. All Head Start agencies are committed to the professional development of their staff, yet they emphasize different routes of occupational socialization and advancement. Some favor competency-based training, stressing the importance of skill mastery as judged by the observed performance of tasks. Others consider formal education and training that leads to college credit, degrees or certification as evidence of mastery. Although many agencies try to blend these approaches, they faced hard choices when awarding salary increases. Agencies also had to decide whether training outside the context of formal education, or training within a college credit-based system, would receive greater reward.

The following are two representative comments:

- *Our agency has supported community people since its inception. I guess that is one of the reasons why I mentioned earlier that I have fears about tying salary enhancement to credentials. Those with credentials may not do their job any better than people who have had on-the-job training or people with innate skills.*

- *We live in a world where people give credibility, especially in the field of education, to credentials. Half the parents who came into the education component in our agency now have a Bachelor's degree in early childhood education.*

How can a Head Start agency balance its roles as a program offering services to people living in poverty and as an employer providing jobs and opportunities that will bring an end to poverty?

The Head Start community is committed to improving the quality of life for adults as well as children in poor communities. By providing jobs and services, Head Start functions as a vehicle for moving families "up and out" of poverty. There are countless stories of Head Start parents who began as volunteers in their child's classroom, became home visitors or teaching assistants, and eventually secured jobs as teachers in public schools or as administrators of Head Start or other social service programs. On the other hand, many former Head Start parents now work for Head Start in poverty-level jobs.

Salary improvement dollars forced Head Start agencies to clarify their functions as employer, service provider and change agent within the community. Informants readily spoke about these issues when discussing the salary funds:

- *I think that sometimes even within the Head Start community, there is a belief that people shouldn't make decent salaries--a "how come you're paying those people that much money" kind of thing. So many people in the community don't have any job at all. What do we really think people should have?*

- *Our parents are committed to evaluating salaries because they look at themselves as potential paid employees. Seventy-two percent of our staff are former Head Start parents.*

- *I think we're moving away from thinking that because this is a poverty program we need to "think poverty" for ourselves, that we have to be in poverty ourselves. There are dedicated people that I work with; what I appreciate about the salary enhancement is that now we can provide some extra for these families and be able to say we're going to honor you by having this amount of money that you can look forward to almost on a yearly basis.*

- *We have had to set some minimums on the number of positions requiring degrees, because we saw that we were about to change the cultural diversity in our programs. As salaries got better, it was easier to get people with a Bachelor's degree. Those people tended to be Caucasian middle-class people. We did not want our program's multiculturalism to be lost, so we really had to stop and look at that and say that that is not what we want to become. We've made a commitment that 50 percent of our staff will be recruited and enrolled from the Head Start parent population.*

These comments reflect the underlying issues that affect decision-making about salaries in Head Start agencies. In a low-income community with scarce resources, providing better jobs for some people can be a threat to employment for others. There is a fundamental conflict between providing more jobs *and* better paying jobs when dollars are limited. There is also a threat to social cohesion between providers and users of services as the differential between parent and staff incomes increases, particularly if better salaries attract people from outside the community. At the same time, it is ironic that agencies that provide opportunity to low-income people to build skills and further their education cannot sufficiently reward these achievements or benefit from the investment they have made in staff. Head Start agencies commonly provide economic mobility for their staff by helping them gain the experience, skills and often the credentials necessary to gain access to better-paying early childhood jobs, typically in the public schools. As one informant stated, "Our goal is to be able to say to people, you can improve your income not only by going up, through, and out of Head Start, but by going up, through, and staying in."

Informants shared a number of approaches used by their agencies to deal with these issues, including reserving a certain percentage of positions for community members; developing a salary schedule that recognizes informal training as well as formal educational achievement in determining competency of staff; providing financial and other support to staff to ensure their access to educational opportunities; and establishing a salary schedule that rewards educational achievements.

The Role of Managerial Leadership in Resolving these Questions

The specific positions which agencies took on the issues discussed above appear to be less important than the process by which they came to a decision. In every workplace, people have held strong opinions about these issues, and directors who recognized this fact, according to our informants, were better able to navigate the decision-making process.

- *From a management point of view, if you are going to have any variability in the increase in salaries, there must be a great deal of openness about the rationale behind the different raises or it will create a lot of dissension.*

- *Last year we developed a salary task force made up of various staff representing all different positions. What we really started taking a look at was not so much the salaries compared to other positions outside our agency, but the internal ranking of positions on our salary schedule. We did that based on responsibility and complexity of duties. It was a real eye-opener for us, and it helped to air a lot of frustration that was under the surface.*

Directors with whom we spoke felt far more enthusiastic about their salary improvement efforts when they had used the opportunity to build some consensus among staff about the rationales for salaries and raises. Some directors had worked through these issues with staff, particularly if there was a collective bargaining agreement, prior to the availability of salary improvement funds. But many had never confronted these issues directly, and were forced to articulate their philosophy when the funds became available. Among our informants, those who appeared most positive about the experience greeted the salary improvement dollars as an opportunity to think about and clarify compensation issues within their organizations.

Similarly, staff who worked in agencies where there was a clear rationale for increases, particularly if they were involved in the discussion, viewed the improvements positively. Staff were understandably more disgruntled if they were not clear about how and why funds were distributed. Particularly in programs without well-articulated and public salary schedules, staff felt that funds were siphoned off the top for management and/or given to favored employees.

Based on informants' reports, the degree to which directors' leadership styles and skills fostered dialogue, even in the midst of charged issues, appeared critical to the process of implementing salary enhancements. Other factors influencing success included whether directors had access to supportive colleagues (such as other Head Start directors, or board members) with whom they could "think out loud," seek advice and share frustrations. The degree of ideological accord within agencies, particularly about the role of Head Start in relation to the community, also affected the level of tension experienced by the agency in the salary enhancement process.

❖ Challenge Two
Structural Features of Head Start Programs that Impact the Implementations of Salary Improvements

Head Start serves approximately 750,000 children and their families each year, through a network of nearly 2,000 grantees[14] and delegate agencies with some 36,600 classrooms and nearly 600 home visiting programs. Because Head Start has developed to meet the needs of local communities, programs operate within a range of structures including school systems, community action agencies,

---

[14] Grantees are programs receiving funds directly from the Head Start Bureau, programs that sub-contract with grantees for their funding are called delegate agencies. Head Start programs also include Parent-Child Centers and Comprehensive Child Development Programs (CCDPs). This year 25 new early Head Start programs for infants and toddlers will be added to the Head Start community.

government agencies (e.g., city or county), independent nonprofits established for the limited purpose of providing Head Start services and Indian tribal governance. Programs for children from migrant families may operate under any of these auspices. Most Head Start programs operate within an agency structure that includes other educational or social services. Even limited-purpose grantees which operate only Head Start programs may oversee contracts with a number of delegate agencies, each with different salary schedules and governance structures. These services are usually targeted toward low-income clients, supported through other funding streams and subject to different regulations. The diversity of the structures within which programs operate, while positive on many fronts for the Head Start staff and clients, created complications when it came to the distribution of salary improvement funds.

The Impact of Multiple Funding Sources

All Head Start programs receive federal funds. In addition, some programs receive financial support from other public (e.g., city, county or state) and private sources. These supplementary funds enable them to serve more families or to extend their hours of operation, which all regard as a positive achievement. Programs relying on multiple funding streams, however, faced a predicament when they received salary enhancement funds from the federal government but not from their other sources of support.

They had to distribute the new federal dollars across their entire program, find additional funds to cover raises for that portion of their staff that is funded through non-federal sources, and/or serve fewer children with state or local dollars because their costs per child rose when salaries were increased.

In some cases, complications arising from multiple funding streams led programs to turn back salary improvement money or to seek (usually unsuccessfully) to use the funds for other purposes.[15]

- *In some of our delegate agencies, we have both federally-funded and state-funded Head Start programs. Recently, one of my delegate agencies said that she could not accept federal enhancement dollars because she didn't have state dollars to match that.*

Some informants reported that the existence of federal salary funds helped them leverage increases from their non-federal funders. Others found that members of the broader early childhood community who did not receive salary funds discouraged Head Start agencies from seeking additional funds. The

---

[15] In the 1994 reauthorization of the Head Start Expansion and Quality Improvement Act, a provision was included that required programs to use salary funds whether or not there is additional money for other personnel within their agency.

degree of collaboration among the different sectors of the early childhood community, as well as directors' skills in building broad-based support for their programs, were identified as critical determinants in leveraging additional dollars for salary increases.

The Impact of Multi-Purpose, Multi-Delegate Agencies

The majority of Head Start agencies co-exist under the same governance structure as other programs, such as Weatherization, Women, Infants and Children (WIC), and/or other early childhood programs. Many Head Start agencies include child care services, frequently for the same children who attend the Head Start program for part of the day. While other staff are no less in need or deserving of pay raises and educational opportunities than Head Start personnel, no salary improvement funds were available for staff working in other programs within Head Start agencies.

These differences in resources between programs within one organization can potentially create deep divisions, and pose serious dilemmas for those trying to manage them. Informants spoke of Head Start programs being considered the "haves" among the "have nots." In some cases, management returned the funds to the Head Start Bureau, wary of exacerbating the imbalance within their agency among staff of different programs and/or disrupting their agency wide salary schedule. Others saw the Head Start funds less as a threat to agency cohesion and more as the first step toward raising the necessary funds to raise pay for all employees within their organization.

- *What we've tried to do is to plan the budget for other programs in the agency with the understanding that they are going to have to plan how to raise additional dollars for salary adjustments, the same as Head Start. In the last year we were really able to do this, and we gave the same adjustment across the board, which was really great. But people still question the fact that their programs are funded by federal dollars, and if the cost of living is based on a national index, then the government should consider all of their federal dollars as having the same adjustments in their budget.*

- *The hostility and tension within the agency is a real problem for us. It's not just one program, it's Weatherization, it's child care and it's even the fiscal department, which is partially funded through Head Start dollars. Even if we pass on a percentage of the increases on their portion of the funds, they're handling records that indicate people are getting much greater increases than they are.*

- *It seems like since we've been having our executive meetings a little more often and people are really talking things out, maybe it's going to work a little better.*

Grantees operating within a local government, or school district, or any agency in which there was a collective bargaining agreement, encountered great difficulty in distributing the funds to Head Start staff, and in several cases the money was returned. In some school districts, management and/or unions would not accept the funds if Head Start personnel were part of a bargaining unit that included other personnel for whom there was no increase. In some school district grantees, Head Start personnel are not part of any collective bargaining unit. Ironically, while their lack of collective bargaining status historically resulted in a lower pay schedule, the absence of a bargaining agreement made it less problematic for their district to accept the salary funds for Head Start raises, even though salaries for other district personnel were frozen.

Head Start delegate agencies add another issue of complexity to the distribution of salary funds. Often one grantee will manage several distinct Head Start programs, either as part of a multi-purpose or limited-purpose agency. While these programs may share personnel policies and salary schedules, they may also operate under different rules. Within the same grantee, staff performing the same job may be receiving different salaries. When salary improvement funds became available, a choice had to be made whether to distribute the raises equally across programs or target them toward minimizing or eliminating historic inequities between staff within the delegate agencies.

Impediments Related to Specific Auspices

Migrant Programs. These services operate under a variety of auspices--in limited-purpose agencies or as part of multi-purpose, school system, government or community action agencies--and face all the problems outlined above. In addition, the seasonal nature of migrant services (typically no more than four to six months per year) creates unique problems relating to salary improvements. First, often only a third of migrant program staff return from year to year, requiring most programs to initiate a major annual recruitment effort. Informants reported that some local child care and full-year Head Start programs discouraged substantial increases for migrant staff salaries. They feared that if migrant programs paid better, it would fuel turnover among their own staff. In migrant programs that responded to this pressure, an artificial ceiling on salaries was created for staff. Second, depending on their funding cycle,[16] many migrant programs received the salary improvement dollars after their season ended, forcing them to distribute

---

[16] The grant year for Head Start contracts can start at any time of the year. Thus, receiving funds after the completion of services can be a problem for grantees with first and second quarter funding cycles. Sometimes retroactive raises are hard to distribute if employees are no longer on staff.

the funds several months after work was performed rather than as a salary increase received at the time of employment.[17]

Tribal Programs. There is considerable variation among tribal Head Start programs with regard to the degree of autonomy they have from tribal governing structures. Many tribes, for example, have personnel polices setting a probationary period for employment that delayed Head Start programs from distributing raises to recently hired staff. Many policy councils have been supportive of salary enhancements because they see Head Start as a major employer on the reservation. Some tribal Head Start programs experience resistance common to other multi-purpose agencies because the salary improvement funds were not available to all employees. A new provision in the 1994 Head Start Act permits the establishment of a free-standing grant on the reservation in cases where conflict between the Head Start grantee and the tribal authority cannot be resolved.

School System Programs. Head Start programs operating under school system auspices are considered, in some cases, a part of district educational services, while in others they are categorized as adjunct programs. Similarly, Head Start staff may find themselves in a variety of circumstances with respect to the collective bargaining organizations within a district. They may not be included in any labor organization, or included in one that represents only Head Start personnel. Head Start personnel within a school district may be organized with classified (support or clerical) personnel or with certificated (professional or teaching) personnel. Sometimes Head Start personnel are divided among bargaining units, with teachers belonging to one union, management to another, and program and support staff to a third. Teaching staff in Head Start are not necessarily included in the same bargaining unit as other teachers in a school district.

Many of the people we interviewed stated that the division of collective bargaining units within a district reflected the school districts regard for Head Start services. When teachers were organized with other K-12 teachers, for example, there was greater recognition of Head Start as an educational program. In particular, there was concern about how the school district educational community viewed those Head Start personnel and services for which there were not exact equivalents in K-12 programs. They found it hard to get support for improving job classifications and pay for parent involvement coordinators or home visitors because there was little understanding of the purpose and value of these positions among district personnel. Informants reported that it took considerable effort to build support among school board members, principals and K-12 staff for these positions.

---

17 An additional problem for migrant programs relates to the discriminatory practices of the health insurance industry toward seasonal employees. Many programs were committed to using salary improvement funds to provide or extend health coverage to their employees for the full calendar year. Migrant programs, however, found that insurance carriers will not issue annual premiums for such a short work year.

The Role of Leadership and Policy in Overcoming Obstacles Related to Agency Structure

Conflicts arising from multiple funding streams and agency functions were most successfully resolved when someone from Head Start, typically the director and at times a board member, played a leadership role in establishing mutually supportive relationships with other players in the agency or community. When a director was skilled in team building, conflict resolution and negotiation, and had a certain level of political savvy, it was less likely that the funds for salary enhancement would be turned back.

New provisions in the 1994 reauthorization of the Head Start Expansion and Quality Improvement Act instruct agencies to distribute salary improvement funds regardless of whether other programs operated by the grantee have funds to raise salaries for other staff. Several informants welcomed this change, believing that it would provide the legal authority necessary to ensure that funds are distributed. Others felt this provision would make a difference only if the Head Start Bureau at the regional and national levels was willing to back it up. Historically, the Bureau and regional offices have adopted a "hands off" policy toward local conflicts of this nature. Informants felt that if there are no consequences to a grantee for failure to distribute salary improvement funds, it was unlikely that the new provision would have an impact. Some informants also feared that this provision, if implemented in contentious circumstances, would heighten tensions within agencies.

❖ Challenge Three
The Design of the Quality Improvement Initiative and its Impact on Implementation

Despite the challenges identified above, most grantees were able to make considerable strides in upgrading Head Start jobs as a result of the quality improvement set-aside. Many programs also used the availability of the funds as an opportunity to conduct an in-depth analysis of their internal salary schedule and career path policies. They used this analysis to assess their program in comparison with the wider community of early childhood services, and to engage in long-range financial planning. Because there was a dedicated stream of salary improvement funds, as well as money for additional training and cost-of-living adjustments, Head Start programs enjoyed an unprecedented opportunity to improve salaries over and above changes in the cost of living.

While they appreciated these features of the quality improvement set-aside, informants repeatedly raised a number of issues regarding the overall design of the initiative.

Comparability

The 1990 Head Start Expansion and Quality Improvement Act established salary parameters for Head Start staff. The floor was established at the federal minimum wage, which is well-defined and easy to measure. The ceiling, however, was more ambiguous and therefore open to different interpretations. Specifically, the 1990 legislation stated that "persons employed in carrying out programs financed under this subchapter shall not receive compensation at a rate which is: 1) in excess of the average rate of compensation paid in the area where the program is located compared to a substantial number of persons providing substantially comparable services; or 2) in excess of the average rate of compensation paid to a substantial number of the persons providing substantially comparable services in the area of the person's immediately preceding employment, whichever is higher." (United States Congress, 1990.)

This provision was interpreted in several ways, depending on which labor market was selected as a relevant point of comparison. Comparison groups selected included Head Start programs, other child care or early care and education programs and public school child care or elementary programs. Some focused on other programs in their immediate vicinity, while others looked to county or regional programs for comparison. Even when school districts pay relatively low salaries within a region, Head Start salaries for teaching staff and most other positions remain significantly below those of their local school district's early childhood and elementary programs. Only a few Head Start programs narrowed the gap between their salaries and those of the local school district--and this occurred only when a district was experiencing a financial crisis and had frozen wages. Only a limited number of programs view comparability with school district salary schedules as an obtainable goal in the foreseeable future.

- *When we began this, my entry-level teachers were at 74 percent of the starting salaries of the school department staff. They're still at 74 percent because school department salaries have also gone up. So my staff has increased approximately 12 to 15 percent since 1990, but that hasn't made their salaries more comparable with the schools.*

- *Even though salaries have gone up, we lose a lot of teachers to the public school system. We don't begin to have the same benefits package or salary level that they have.*

Using public schools as the point of comparison raised additional issues about how agencies understood comparability. Because many Head Start positions do not have public school counterparts, decisions about how to classify

and compare a home visitor, for example, were made differently in various communities. While it may be relatively easy to compare a school principal and a Head Start director, it is another matter, for example, to decide whether a home visitor job is equal in skill and responsibility to a gardener; the decision made will reflect the value placed on the work and will require serious study of both job positions. Additionally, some agencies made comparisons to public schools only if their staff had the education and credentials that would permit them to qualify for jobs in the district, while others focused on the similarity of the work as the basis for comparison rather than the ability of staff to move between the systems. Thus, in some communities, if a Child Development Associate (CDA) credential was not accepted in the public school preschool program, but was in the local child care center, the wage comparison was made between Head Start and the child care center. If the CDA was accepted, then comparison was made with the school district. Lack of clarity in the design of the salary initiative led to agencies within a community or region choosing different systems to which they compared their salaries.

Lack of Uniform Guidelines for Defining and Targeting Salaries

Head Start programs also employed different strategies for collecting salary data. Some compared only starting wages, while others compared average wages for each position. Some were mistakenly informed that the highest salaries in their communities could not be considered in wage comparisons. Some directors received assistance from regional offices or consultants, but most Head Start directors, who do not tend as a group to be skilled in survey methods, were left to their own devices to gather information. Many expressed the need for guidance from the Bureau about how to collect data. A related request was made by many for stronger guidance from the Bureau regarding uniform salary goals. While most grantees felt strongly that salaries should be a local program decision, they also felt that if the Bureau articulated salary and training goals, it would help them build support for salary increases within their agencies, and would motivate those programs which were reluctant to address salary issues, particularly those at the bottom of the salary range.

Variations in Regional Office Support and Interpretation of the Initiative

Not all regional offices offered consistent support to their grantees or interpreted the initiative in the same way. Some regional offices took a hands-off approach when agencies returned funds because of local conflicts, while others provided more technical assistance and support. Some regional offices approved expenditures on salaries that exceeded the 13 percent mandated set-aside, while others did not. The 1994 reauthorization of the 1990 Act explicitly allows that additional funds can be used for salary improvements. Several informants felt that the Bureau's role in assisting grantees with salary enhancements should be clarified.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings from this study point to several recommendations that might facilitate Head Start programs' use of salary improvement funds. These will be of assistance to others in the early care and education community as well. Those described below focus primarily on salary improvements, training opportunities, salary guidelines, and data collection procedures. These recommendations suggest that the Department of Health and Human Services, in particular the Head Start Bureau, expand and bolster initiatives in these arenas.

❖ Recommendation One
Increase Funds Available for Salary Improvements in Head Start and other Early Care Education Programs

Woven through all our discussions with informants was an acknowledgment of the significance of the salary enhancement initiative, and the desire and need for it to be continued and expanded. Many grantees have made headway in improving compensation for their staff--some quite substantially. Informants were enthusiastic about building upon and increasing these gains, particularly because they continue to feel burdened by the crisis in staff wages. Expansion and quality improvement salary funds for 1995 through 1998, however, are much reduced from those that were available between 1991 and 1995. Many informants expressed concern about their ability to consolidate the recent improvements they have made.

Our first recommendation, therefore, calls for an increase in the funds available for salary improvements as a means to upgrade program quality and to create long-term career opportunities for Head Start personnel. In order for Head Start programs to reap the full benefit of these increases, it is imperative that additional salary funds be made available to child care and other services sharing funding sources and/or administrative structures with Head Start.

❖ Recommendation Two
Provide Management Training for Head Start Directors and Leadership Development for Other Staff

A profile of effective leadership among Head Start directors emerges from the interviews with informants. Similar to the qualities identified for Head Start collaboration project leaders, successful Head Start managers are politically savvy, creative, willing to entertain alternative approaches to problems, clear about their priorities, and willing to involve all stakeholders in planning, problem solving and implementation (Mitchell, 1995). Many Head Start directors lack the skills, or lack opportunities to build the skills, that are necessary to address the pressing challenges of their jobs.

- *Establish guidelines and training for Head Start agency managers, Head Start regional office staff and other early care and education personnel, on conducting wage studies and on interpreting data for wage comparisons.* Head Start administrators at the federal, regional and local level, as well as others directing early childhood programs, require guidance in how to understand, evaluate and conduct wage comparability studies. By providing or contracting for technical assistance training and materials, the Bureau could assist directors already burdened by the political issues surrounding salary improvements.

- *Extend training for directors requiring support in personnel management and administration, including such issues as establishing salary schedules, securing benefits packages, staff relations and strategic planning.* A number of experienced Head Start directors have informally created mentoring relationships with novice directors. In addition, the Johnson and Johnson Management Training Program and the National Head Start Association STAR Institute address relevant issues for directors. The Head Start Bureau can facilitate and support such efforts through publicizing existing resources, and/or making funds available to training and technical assistance providers and others to expand innovative training approaches. Additionally, training at national and regional conferences could focus more directly on management issues. There is tremendous expertise within the Head Start community that can and should be tapped and shared.

- *Encourage line staff involvement and leadership development in strategic planning concerning compensation issues.* When only managerial staff in an agency are involved in decisions concerning the basis salary differentials and rewards, there is much greater potential for dissension among staff. Head Start personnel working directly with children and in other support positions provide an important perspective that can enrich agency policy. Training opportunities for line staff in leadership and management issues is an important

step in career development and can facilitate their effective participation in agency planning.

❖ Recommendation Three
Formulate Salary and Career Development Guidelines for Head Start Positions, and Provide Assistance to Programs which Demonstrate Minimal Progress Toward Reaching Them

A strength of the salary enhancement provision of the quality improvement initiative is its recognition and respect for the importance of community decision-making. In many communities, the initiative has been sufficient to spur concerted action to improve staff compensation. In communities or agencies where persons in authority resist or reject the goals of the quality improvement initiative, however, more rigorous guidelines are needed to safeguard the intent of the legislation and to stimulate compliance with its objectives.

- *Create an articulated career ladder, including recommended levels of education, training and compensation, for each Head Start position, modeled on the principles underlying the Military Child Development Services' Caregiver Personnel Pay Plan.* The formulation of a career development plan, spearheaded by the Head Start Bureau with input from grantees, would provide well-delineated, voluntary goals for agencies and could assist in the evaluation of salary improvement efforts without undermining local agency autonomy.

- *Provide intensive support for agencies falling below a certain level of compensation for Head Start personnel, through training, mentoring and targeted technical assistance.* The demonstrated relationship between salaries, educational achievement and compliance with program performance standards signals the importance of salary enhancement as a vehicle for ensuring that Head Start programs serve children and families most effectively. The inability of some agencies to address the compensation needs of their staff may signal a serious problem in service quality. We call upon the Head Start Bureau to identify programs which require additional support and to assist them in securing it.

❖ Recommendation Four
Improve Salary Data Collection and Dissemination.

The capacity exists for the collection and dissemination of longitudinal, relevant salary and related data about the Head Start work force which could provide grantees with the essential information they require for wage comparability studies. If properly collected, these data could provide the Head Start program with a valuable measure of its progress in building a more skilled and better-compensated work force.

- *Revise the Program Information Reports to address the problems outlined in this study.* As a first step, salary data should be collected in hourly units to permit comparisons between programs operating under different time frames. A number of other adjustments should be considered, including collecting salary and education data for each staff position in order to track the link between improved training and compensation. We encourage the Head Start Bureau to call upon members of the Head Start and early care and education communities who are knowledgeable about salary data collection procedures and the limits of existing measures to help redesign the PIR instrument. Consideration should be given to adding new questions that could tap issues raised by the community, but not captured by the PIR survey.

- *Build the capacity of regional offices to access PIR data and appropriate wage information for their region.* This recommendation is predicated on the implementation of the previous recommendation. It would also require modernization of the database to ensure easy access. Currently, the regional offices and those holding contracts for training and technical assistance vary considerably with regard to their expertise and commitment to assisting programs with wage comparability studies. Staff in a few regions are exceptionally skilled in this area. A plan should be devised to ensure that each region has the expertise to take advantage of the availability of PIR and HSCOST data for their region on the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services mainframe. This may require training for regional staff and/or contracting with knowledgeable consultants.

- *Assist in the collection of other data needed for wage comparability studies.* The Head Start Bureau could work with the Department of Educational Statistics to make public school salary data available for wage comparability studies. Child care salary data, while identified as a reporting category in the Child Care and Development Block Grant, are not consistently collected by states. The Department of Health and Human Services could investigate how these data can be made more readily available. It could also work with the Department of Labor to restructure its early care and education reporting categories in order to provide other information for wage comparisons. This

would eliminate the need for local Head Start managers to collect local data which is often inaccurate.

- *Pursue research about benefits options for Head Start agencies.* Benefits are a critical component of any compensation package, and increasingly the vulnerability of affordable and comprehensive health coverage is cause for great concern throughout the country. The Head Start Bureau can play a leadership role in researching benefits options, helping grantees to negotiate viable packages and intervening in support of Migrant Head Start agencies and others who have been denied coverage because of the nature of their job categories or services.

VI. CONCLUSION

Head Start programs have contributed to our national well-being by helping poor children enter school ready to learn and by helping their parents to develop skills for economic self-sufficiency. Head Start programs have also created important job opportunities, especially for people living in poverty. The capacity of Head Start to continue to effectively deliver on its potential rests with a skilled and stable work force, and better compensation is critical to the recruitment and retention of qualified staff. The Head Start Expansion and Quality Improvement Act's salary set-aside provisions mark a groundbreaking step in the right direction for Head Start children, parents and staff. This report documents the provision's effectiveness and limitations, and suggests how they can be strengthened. The lessons from the Head Start community chronicled in this report can also inform efforts in other sectors of the early care and education field which share the urgent need for improving staff compensation.

APPENDIX 1
Data Sources

Program Information Reports (PIR data)

Every Head Start program is required to complete an annual Program Information Report which includes a description of the scope of its services, characteristics of children and families served and information about staff earnings and educational background. Earnings are based on expenditures reported by directors for different staff positions during the current academic year. The Head Start Bureau sends reporting forms to programs in mid-April; these are due by May 31 of the same year. Some programs provide data at a later date, however, because their school year extends beyond May 31. These reports are submitted to Ellsworth Associates, a federal contractor which enters data from local Head Start programs on the federal Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) mainframe. PIR calculations are checked by regional Head Start offices, but the data are not routinely validated for accuracy.

Head Start Cost Reports (PCCOST/HCCOST) [18]

Programs develop a budget as part of the annual grant application process. Most programs now use the same format for this information and enter it into a computerized program called PCCOST. Although PCCOST report data do not provide information about actual expenditures, a comparison of actual expenditures and PCCOST reports found only a 4 percent deviation between proposed and actual costs (Brush, Gaidurgis, and Best, 1993). In 1993-94, 80 to 85 percent of all Head Start programs submitted budget information using the Head Start Cost Report format, including data about salaries and benefits. In 1993, only a half, and in 1992, only a third of programs submitted budget data using the HSCOST format. Program data are available annually from grant applications, and are entered into the HHS mainframe by the Head Start Regional offices.

---

[18] Local PCCOST data are uploaded to a mainframe system called HCCOST. HCCOST provides analytic reports for those specialists responsible for program oversight.

Head Start Monitoring and Tracking Reports

In contrast to the director-reported PIR and HSCOST data, the Monitoring and Tracking Reports are based on observations and interviews made by regional Head Start Bureau staff and a team of peer review experts. Using the On-site Program Review Instrument (OSPRI), a determination of compliance or non-compliance with established Head Start performance standards is made for each program. Included in the OSPRI are performance standards for the following program components: education, health, mental health, nutrition, social services, parent involvement, disabilities services, eligibility and recruitment, administration, fiscal management procedures and staffing. By law, one third of Head Start programs are to be assessed each year, and new programs are assessed with the OSPRI after their first year of operation. Assessment of new programs takes priority; all other programs are therefore assessed in turn every few years. Numerical rankings are entered into the HHS mainframe by the Pelavin Research Institute.

Narrative comments gathered through visits are available on the local area network (LAN) used by regional offices and Head Start grantees. No inter-rater reliability is established between the observation teams using the OSPRI.

APPENDIX 2
Salary Tables

NOTE: Because of limitations in these data outlined earlier in this report, these findings should be used with caution.

Directors (N=1599)

Median and Mean Salaries and Average Percentage Increases, All Regions and Auspices Combined, 1992-1994

YEAR	MEDIAN SALARY	MEAN SALARY	RANGE	AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
1992	$29,879	$31,544	$10,340-77,326	8.7
1993	31,824	33,719	10,948-84,000	7.7
1994	33,688	35,809	10,483-81,420	na

Average Salaries by Education Level

LEVEL	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
HS or less	24	$24,615	18	$29,999	19	$28,672
Some college	287	26,621	280	28,567	278	30,856
College degree	625	29,958	634	32,118	629	34,429
Graduate degree	663	35,420	661	37,505	669	39,347

Average Salaries by Tenure

YEARS	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
0-1	246	$28,231	185	$29,606	213	$33,469
2-5	471	29,858	479	31,792	434	33,160
6-10	342	31,404	366	32,929	362	34,846
11-15	216	33,682	229	35,639	212	37,423
16 or more	324	35,321	340	38,230	378	40,187

Average Salaries and Average Percentage Increases by Salary Levels

QUARTILE	1992 SALARY	1993 SALARY	1994 SALARY	92-93 PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 PERCENT INCREASE
Lowest	$19,953	$21,608	$23,019	16.1	15.0
Second	27,056	28,863	30,706	6.8	6.8
Third	32,983	35,352	37,399	7.9	5.4
Highest	46,219	49,093	52,153	3.2	3.2

Directors (continued)

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Region

REGION	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
1	85	$34,000	$36,468	$38,174	8.9	5.9
2	199	32,444	34,734	36,118	8.8	4.5
3	154	32,290	34,567	36,542	8.2	6.8
4	231	31,472	33,421	35,809	7.3	8.5
5	289	32,195	34,079	36,284	7.6	8.8
6	165	28,843	31,396	33,242	10.5	7.1
7	69	28,714	30,533	32,490	6.7	6.6
8	64	27,192	29,016	32,464	8.8	13.5
9	143	39,086	42,192	44,712	11.1	7.3
10	61	31,349	34,180	37,195	10.9	15.3
11	101	24,464	25,721	26,312	6.7	3.0
12	38	28,726	31,160	34,990	11.2	11.9

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Auspice

AUSPICE*	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
CAA	613	$29,395	$31,731	$33,886	8.7	7.2
SS	259	36,780	38,977	41,110	11.9	9.6
NP	549	32,997	35,206	37,400	7.5	7.7
GA	76	30,066	31,778	34,457	6.5	10.0
Tribal	102	24,440	25,754	26,353	6.9	3.0

* CAA = Community Action Agency
SS = School System
NP = Other Non-profit Agency
GA = Government Agency, e.g., county, city
Tribal = Tribal Program

Social Services Coordinators (N=1117)

Median and Mean Salaries and Average Percentage Increases, All Regions and Auspices Combined, 1992-1994

YEAR	MEDIAN SALARY	MEAN SALARY	RANGE	AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
1992	$18,775	$19,458	$ 5,216-63,616	10.1
1993	20,000	20,885	5,400-65,176	9.8
1994	21,784	22,441	5,100-65,176	na

Average Salaries by Education Level

LEVEL	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
HS or less	113	$15,155	95	$17,358	95	$18,760
Some college	381	17,736	380	18,875	351	20,223
College degree	623	20,048	642	21,290	671	22,543
Graduate degree	154	25,075	159	26,565	171	28,742

Average Salaries by Tenure

YEARS	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
0-1	268	$17,897	176	$19,223	206	$20,982
2-5	389	19,000	470	19,816	432	21,714
6-10	193	19,375	186	21,541	215	23,274
11-15	141	21,280	139	22,130	103	22,961
16 or more	126	22,276	146	24,297	161	24,810

Average Salaries and Average Percentage Increases by Salary Levels

QUARTILE	1992 SALARY	1993 SALARY	1994 SALARY	92-93 PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 PERCENT INCREASE
Lowest	$11,703	$12,862	$13,986	23.2	20.2
Second	17,039	18,180	19,710	8.4	9.5
Third	20,596	22,090	23,770	6.2	5.6
Highest	28,520	30,493	32,321	2.8	3.7

Social Services Coordinators (continued)

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Region

REGION	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
1	77	$21,780	$23,115	$24,926	6.8	10.5
2	138	19,425	21,148	22,285	11.3	6.5
3	117	21,115	22,238	23,886	8.7	9.2
4	186	18,937	20,105	21,513	7.8	8.7
5	195	19,596	21,446	23,258	12.3	11.3
6	114	16,504	18,019	19,765	13.5	12.6
7	52	16,935	18,429	19,528	13.1	8.2
8	45	17,358	18,321	19,814	7.8	10.8
9	83	23,977	25,519	26,971	9.8	6.5
10	49	20,978	22,273	24,791	10.7	20.0
11	35	16,358	17,544	18,989	12.1	8.7
12	26	16,311	16,988	17,802	3.7	5.0

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Auspice

AUSPICE	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
CAA	484	$18,668	$20,129	$21,546	9.8	8.8
SS	158	21,300	22,330	23,887	9.2	10.8
NP	386	20,171	21,758	23,533	11.2	10.9
GA	53	18,144	19,608	20,876	8.8	6.8
Tribal	36	16,264	17,223	18,745	10.3	10.4

Parent Involvement Coordinators (N=682)

Median and Mean Salaries and Average Percentage Increases, All Regions and Auspices Combined, 1992-1994

YEAR	MEDIAN SALARY	MEAN SALARY	RANGE	AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
1992	$17,180	$18,034	$ 5,408-6,058	9.5
1993	18,165	19,186	5,556-62,138	10.3
1994	19,847	20,659	5,100-64,132	na

Average Salaries by Education Level

LEVEL	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
HS or less	133	$14,352	127	$15,825	130	$17,062
Some college	275	17,125	285	18,210	281	19,854
College degree	233	19,777	224	20,789	229	22,386
Graduate degree	41	26,171	46	26,714	42	27,758

Average Salaries by Tenure

YEARS	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
0-1	185	$16,140	129	$16,264	119	$18,880
2-5	223	17,343	279	18,565	285	19,712
6-10	103	19,504	106	20,778	121	20,919
11-15	77	19,049	86	20,918	75	23,115
16 or more	84	21,388	82	22,026	82	23,898

Average Salaries and Average Percentage Increases by Salary Levels

QUARTILE	1992 SALARY	1993 SALARY	1994 SALARY	92-93 PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 PERCENT INCREASE
Lowest	$10,244	$11,002	$12,175	21.7	21.5
Second	15,194	16,265	17,571	7.8	8.4
Third	19,277	20,568	22,104	5.9	8.6
Highest	27,459	28,951	30,828	2.5	2.6

Parent Involvement Coordinators (continued)

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Region

REGION	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
1	40	$20,407	$21,654	$23,188	9.3	7.9
2	73	17,119	17,485	18,538	5.2	7.1
3	83	20,199	21,359	22,410	8.3	5.9
4	101	18,411	19,118	20,919	5.4	13.7
5	114	17,982	19,436	21,456	9.5	14.2
6	72	16,108	17,676	19,649	11.2	11.9
7	30	15,301	16,193	17,625	10.5	11.6
8	38	14,903	16,458	17,360	15.6	6.5
9	70	21,479	22,733	23,758	11.9	8.2
10	13	17,004	20,238	20,537	36.9	1.6
11	30	13,675	14,623	15,149	9.3	4.2
12	18	18,175	19,238	22,325	5.0	29.7

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Auspice

AUSPICE	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
CAA	263	$17,234	$18,424	$20,052	9.3	9.9
SS	114	18,792	19,758	20,472	9.5	7.8
NP	228	19,472	20,747	22,401	8.2	11.1
GA	45	16,598	17,383	19,581	17.7	13.3
Tribal	32	13,675	14,429	15,415	7.6	12.4

Education Coordinators (N=1287)

Median and Mean Salaries and Average Percentage Increases, All Regions and Auspices Combined, 1992-1994

YEAR	MEDIAN SALARY	MEAN SALARY	RANGE	AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
1992	$20,446	$21,848	$5,267-69,969	9.5
1993	21,992	23,286	5,582-66,737	8.8
1994	23,818	24,892	6,275-66,737	na

Average Salaries by Education Level

LEVEL	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
HS or less	35	$16,131	31	$17,028	32	$19,077
Some college	285	18,026	298	19,265	297	20,957
College degree	622	21,329	623	22,827	609	24,233
Graduate degree	345	26,522	335	28,297	349	29,921

Average Salaries by Tenure

YEARS	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
0-1	306	$19,658	218	$20,670	226	$22,274
2-5	484	21,595	567	22,418	552	23,971
6-10	251	23,230	246	24,986	245	26,500
11-15	120	23,988	137	25,794	131	27,779
16 or more	126	23,357	119	25,803	133	27,353

Average Salaries and Average Percentage Increases by Salary Levels

QUARTILE	1992 SALARY	1993 SALARY	1994 SALARY	92-93 PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 PERCENT INCREASE
Lowest	$13,449	$14,775	$15,870	21.7	17.6
Second	18,399	19,788	21,404	9.2	9.0
Third	22,988	24,509	26,371	5.9	5.4
Highest	32,592	34,106	35,955	1.1	3.1

Education Coordinators (continued)

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Region

REGION	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
1	77	$23,870	$25,714	$26,894	8.5	5.4
2	160	24,040	25,511	26,703	8.3	5.2
3	128	23,351	24,585	25,820	7.0	6.6
4	203	20,272	21,622	23,655	9.1	11.1
5	233	22,362	23,981	25,672	10.0	9.2
6	126	18,794	20,474	21,804	10.2	8.4
7	64	19,221	20,567	21,526	9.7	5.8
8	50	18,109	20,120	21,276	17.6	8.2
9	99	27,591	28,126	31,156	4.9	14.8
10	56	22,141	23,566	25,624	10.2	14.1
11	53	18,530	19,842	21,769	11.1	10.8
12	38	17,457	19,100	19,515	15.8	4.5

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Auspice

AUSPICE	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
CAA	566	$19,973	$21,476	$23,104	9.1	8.6
SS	143	28,335	29,568	30,805	10.6	6.7
NP	455	22,571	24,085	25,702	9.7	9.2
GA	69	21,669	22,648	24,215	7.1	7.4
Tribal	54	18,483	19,697	22,006	10.4	14.1

Health Coordinators (N=1296)

Median and Mean Salaries and Average Percentage Increases, All Regions and Auspices Combined, 1992-1994

YEAR	MEDIAN SALARY	MEAN SALARY	RANGE	AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
1992	$17,871	$18,920	$ 5,261-57,363	8.9
1993	18,914	20,153	5,129-60,743	10.0
1994	20,512	21,729	5,304-58,820	na

Average Salaries by Education Level

LEVEL	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
HS or less	146	$15,099	122	$16,110	125	$16,927
Some college	525	17,202	537	18,317	499	20,085
College degree	515	20,414	528	21,551	551	22,864
Graduate degree	110	25,198	109	26,950	121	28,305

Average Salaries by Tenure

YEARS	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
0-1	314	$16,752	252	$18,841	261	$20,357
2-5	465	18,484	519	19,027	496	20,440
6-10	259	19,731	242	21,245	255	22,580
11-15	153	20,544	161	21,576	153	23,820
16 or more	105	22,967	122	23,605	131	25,239

Average Salaries and Average Percentage Increases by Salary Levels

QUARTILE	1992 SALARY	1993 SALARY	1994 SALARY	92-93 PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 PERCENT INCREASE
Lowest	$11,288	$12,347	$13,518	20.0	20.0
Second	16,017	17,052	18,567	7.8	8.7
Third	19,870	21,175	22,808	5.3	6.9
Highest	28,505	30,063	32,022	2.5	4.5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Health Coordinators (continued)

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Region

REGION	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
1	75	$21,278	$22,541	$24,374	7.9	11.2
2	125	19,302	20,415	21,937	7.6	7.9
3	132	18,901	19,896	21,165	7.0	8.2
4	205	18,131	19,363	21,097	8.0	11.7
5	230	19,244	20,649	22,222	10.2	10.4
6	150	17,375	18,400	19,965	8.7	10.0
7	67	17,913	19,077	20,182	9.8	7.3
8	57	16,327	18,277	19,666	17.0	8.0
9	108	23,952	25,337	27,623	6.8	12.3
10	42	19,688	20,900	22,039	9.3	9.0
11	68	16,201	17,180	18,312	8.1	8.8
12	37	16,800	18,054	19,961	12.4	13.7

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Auspice

AUSPICE	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
CAA	572	$18,451	$19,739	$21,217	8.8	8.7
SS	192	20,609	21,772	23,301	9.2	11.5
NP	397	19,194	20,548	22,416	9.7	11.7
GA	66	19,280	19,775	21,074	5.6	8.1
Tribal	69	16,190	17,157	18,264	8.0	8.7

Most Tenured Teachers* (N=1732)

Median and Mean Salaries and Average Percentage Increases, All Regions and Auspices Combined, 1992-1994

YEAR	MEDIAN SALARY	MEAN SALARY	RANGE	AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
1992	$14,564	$15,940	$5,265-55,000	9.0
1993	15,496	17,022	5,554-58,000	6.7
1994	16,195	17,883	5,840-65,000	na

Average Salaries by Education Level

LEVEL	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
HS or less	231	$12,852	237	$14,070	233	$14,573
Some college	783	13,881	773	14,811	774	15,576
College degree	584	17,560	584	18,642	593	19,646
Graduate degree	134	26,228	138	27,610	132	29,324

Average Salaries by Tenure

YEARS	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
0-1	142	$15,027	66	$15,959	54	$16,705
2-5	308	16,355	349	1,675	386	17,870
6-10	349	16,258	372	17,335	380	17,991
11-15	305	16,426	290	17,288	301	18,087
16 or more	651	15,536	655	17,016	679	17,827

Average Salaries and Average Percentage Increases by Salary Levels

QUARTILE	1992 SALARY	1993 SALARY	1994 SALARY	92-93 PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 PERCENT INCREASE
Lowest	$ 9,844	$10,642	$11,233	17.6	12.3
Second	13,039	13,955	14,763	9.4	9.0
Third	16,098	17,228	18,196	6.3	4.6
Highest	24,779	26,261	27,339	2.7	1.0

* **Refers to the individual teacher in each program with the longest tenure.**

Most Tenured Teachers (continued)

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Region

REGION	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
1	87	$16,284	$17,270	$17,819	8.1	4.3
2	208	19,499	20,641	21,293	7.6	4.0
3	161	17,263	18,169	18,968	7.8	6.1
4	258	13,914	15,157	16,078	9.5	7.7
5	319	16,861	18,191	18,992	10.2	6.0
6	183	14,302	15,294	16,431	10.6	8.9
7	81	15,371	16,541	17,098	10.9	7.9
8	65	14,096	14,474	15,382	3.9	7.7
9	158	16,931	18,125	19,437	9.6	8.1
10	62	15,980	16,574	17,835	4.7	9.6
11	108	13,089	14,133	14,815	9.7	6.7
12	42	12,614	13,071	13,444	8.1	4.5

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Auspice

AUSPICE	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
CAA	623	$13,803	$14,807	$15,669	9.3	7.4
SS	345	20,649	21,981	23,171	10.1	7.4
NP	579	16,092	17,198	17,855	8.5	5.4
GA	75	15,051	15,560	16,729	4.2	7.6
Tribal	110	13,073	14,081	14,773	9.5	6.8

Least Tenured Teachers* (N=1641)

Median and Mean Salaries and Average Percentage Increases, All Regions and Auspices Combined, 1992-1994

YEAR	MEDIAN SALARY	MEAN SALARY	RANGE	AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
1992	$11,635	$12,958	$ 5,141-5,500	9.0
1993	12,480	13,783	5,017-58,000	6.8
1994	13,056	14,350	5,188-57,000	na

Average Salaries by Education Level

LEVEL	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
HS or less	267	$10,357	251	$11,129	241	$11,865
Some college	639	11,894	652	12,293	643	13,132
College degree	672	14,292	675	15,617	679	15,704
Graduate degree	63	20,537	63	20,140	78	20,488

Average Salaries by Tenure

YEARS	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
0-1	1,116	$12,448	1,047	$13,325	1,092	$13,937
2-5	373	13,964	439	14,676	419	15,164
6-10	90	14,813	83	15,458	79	15,794
11-15	28	13,162	32	13,180	24	14,862
16 or more	0	--	40	12,981	24	14,350

Average Salaries and Average Percentage Increases by Salary Levels

QUARTILE	1992 SALARY	1993 SALARY	1994 SALARY	92-93 PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 PERCENT INCREASE
Lowest	$ 8,141	$ 8,607	$ 9,189	19.4	16.4
Second	10,562	11,295	11,854	9.8	8.1
Third	13,169	14,124	14,774	7.3	3.9
Highest	19,970	21,140	21,635	1.0	1.0

* **Refers to the individual teacher in each program with the least tenure.**

Least Tenured Teachers (continued)

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Region

REGION	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
1	84	$13,082	$13,802	$13,910	9.2	3.9
2	196	16,665	12,571	17,876	7.0	3.1
3	155	13,593	14,399	15,111	8.5	7.3
4	255	11,500	12,129	12,665	7.0	6.5
5	298	13,600	14,675	15,114	10.5	6.3
6	178	11,615	12,107	12,987	9.5	10.2
7	77	11,860	13,015	13,279	13.2	6.4
8	61	11,024	11,620	12,502	8.7	8.4
9	150	13,612	14,490	15,401	9.1	8.9
10	60	11,630	12,804	13,583	12.3	8.0
11	95	11,078	11,804	12,349	8.3	6.6
12	32	11,275	12,123	13,162	10.1	10.3

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Auspice

AUSPICE	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
CAA	606	$11,098	$11,923	$12,447	10.0	6.9
SS	310	16,085	17,137	17,615	10.0	6.3
NP	557	13,646	14,399	15,032	8.0	6.7
GA	71	12,382	12,996	13,991	6.5	8.7
Tribal	97	11,054	11,733	12,308	7.9	7.0

Most Tenured Aides* (N=1672)

Median and Mean Salaries and Average Percentage Increases, All Regions and Auspices Combined, 1992-1994

YEAR	MEDIAN SALARY	MEAN SALARY	RANGE	AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
1992	$ 9,455	$10,085	$ 4,016-34,002	8.7
1993	10,070	10,716	4,014-25,667	7.4
1994	10,745	11,314	4,127-26,000	na

Average Salaries by Education Level

LEVEL	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
HS or less	859	$ 9,790	844	$10,407	831	$11,032
Some college	745	10,325	759	10,969	752	11,487
College degree	64	11,180	67	11,681	85	12,534
Graduate degree	4	11,085	2	13,172	4	11,292

Average Salaries by Tenure

YEARS	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
0-1	191	$ 8,892	121	$ 9,448	92	$10,522
2-5	485	9,278	534	9,790	545	10,255
6-10	354	10,126	369	11,008	393	11,177
11-15	642	11,026	648	11,550	642	12,410
16 or more	0	--	0	--	0	--

Average Salaries and Average Percentage Increases by Salary Levels

QUARTILE	1992 SALARY	1993 SALARY	1994 SALARY	92-93 PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 PERCENT INCREASE
Lowest	$ 6,535	$ 7,072	$ 7,421	20.0	14.8
Second	8,552	9,162	9,806	9.2	10.0
Third	10,592	11,258	11,915	4.7	4.0
Highest	14,660	15,372	16,112	.2	.7

* **Refers to the individual aide in each program with most tenure.**

Most Tenured Aides (continued)

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Region

REGION	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
1	82	$10,873	$11,348	$11,645	7.7	4.4
2	205	12,720	13,384	13,944	7.1	5.0
3	157	10,216	10,496	11,179	4.6	7.5
4	255	9,385	10,082	10,582	8.3	6.5
5	302	9,973	10,827	11,271	11.0	6.7
6	180	9,275	9,799	10,552	7.8	9.0
7	79	8,789	9,638	9,954	15.3	4.8
8	62	8,258	8,557	9,159	6.1	8.2
9	152	10,440	11,117	12,017	10.5	9.9
10	54	9,741	10,438	11,538	10.6	14.0
11	102	9,661	10,153	10,834	6.5	8.4
12	42	9,044	9,756	10,416	11.4	10.8

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Auspice

AUSPICE	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
CAA	603	$ 9,639	$10,254	$10,973	8.9	8.3
SS	330	9,461	10,528	10,995	8.8	6.7
NP	561	10,680	11,406	11,934	8.9	6.7
GA	74	10,427	10,922	11,530	7.5	6.5
Tribal	104	9,612	10,128	10,801	6.9	8.2

Least Tenured Aides* (N=1567)

Median and Mean Salaries and Average Percentage Increases, All Regions and Auspices Combined, 1992-1994

N=1567	YEAR	MEDIAN SALARY	MEAN SALARY	RANGE	AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
	1992	$ 8,000	$ 8,600	$ 4,006-33,414	8.7
	1993	8,465	9,102	4,118-23,700	5.8
	1994	8,880	9,474	4,031-34,567	na

Average Salaries by Education Level

LEVEL	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
HS or less	936	$ 8,313	974	$ 8,928	961	$ 9,160
Some college	518	9,030	485	9,431	488	9,898
College degree	110	9,016	108	9,190	111	10,222
Graduate degree	3	8,398	0	--	7	10,997

Average Salaries by Tenure

YEARS	NUMBER	1992	NUMBER	1993	NUMBER	1994
0-1	1,223	$ 8,357	1,113	$ 8,750	1,182	$ 9,188
2-5	268	9,121	372	9,682	310	10,057
6-10	47	10,796	51	11,289	48	11,510
11-15	18	10,065	17	11,663	14	11,282
16 or more	11	11,146	14	10,628	13	12,078

Average Salaries and Average Percentage Increases by Salary Levels

QUARTILE	1992 SALARY	1993 SALARY	1994 SALARY	92-93 PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 PERCENT INCREASE
Lowest	$ 5,587	$ 6,001	$ 6,202	22.3	13.1
Second	7,299	7,759	8,125	9.0	6.9
Third	8,918	9,351	9,857	4.0	3.8
Highest	12,626	13,299	13,747	1.0	1.0

* **Refers to the individual aides in each program with the least tenure.**

Least Tenured Aides (continued)

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Region

REGION	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
1	75	$ 8,823	$ 9,354	$ 9,650	8.9	5.3
2	195	11,296	11,799	12,160	6.7	3.5
3	149	8,148	8,636	8,865	8.0	4.4
4	251	8,010	8,311	8,619	5.0	5.4
5	273	8,682	9,392	9,687	11.3	5.6
6	176	7,707	8,142	8,694	7.6	7.6
7	73	7,291	7,951	7,788	14.0	1.5
8	57	6,718	7,132	7,421	8.8	4.8
9	144	8,739	9,391	9,862	12.4	6.9
10	46	7,996	8,857	9,820	15.0	12.8
11	92	8,772	8,879	9,517	5.0	7.7
12	36	8,662	9,091	9,789	7.2	10.9

Mean Salary and Average Percentage Increase by Auspice

AUSPICE	NUMBER	1992 MEAN SALARY	1993 MEAN SALARY	1994 MEAN SALARY	92-93 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE	93-94 AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE
CAA	577	$ 8,066	$ 8,564	$ 8,895	8.6	5.5
SS	300	8,168	8,737	9,069	10.6	6.4
NP	525	9,372	9,907	10,287	8.5	5.4
GA	71	8,878	9,400	9,820	7.3	5.4
Tribal	94	8,727	8,851	9,508	5.2	8.0

Percentage of New Staff 1989 to 1994 as a Result of Expansion and Turnover

YEAR	PERCENT NEW TEACHER POSITIONS DUE TO EXPANSION	PERCENT REPLACED TEACHERS DUE TO TURNOVER
1994	10.33	12.56
1993	7.84	12.85
1992	9.44	12.60
1991	11.56	12.86
1990	2.73	13.42
1989	2.82	13.94

YEAR	PERCENT NEW ASSISTANT TEACHER POSITIONS DUE TO EXPANSION	PERCENT REPLACED ASSISTANT TEACHERS DUE TO TURNOVER
1994	11.12	21.41
1993	7.76	21.50
1992	9.96	21.75
1991	11.97	21.84
1990	3.00	20.75
1989	2.94	22.22

YEAR	PERCENT NEW HOME VISITOR POSITIONS DUE TO EXPANSION	PERCENT REPLACED HOME VISITORS DUE TO TURNOVER
1994	10.24	21.16
1993	6.25	17.96
1992	9.02	20.72
1991	11.66	24.03
1990	4.94	23.09
1989	3.05	22.93

Grantees and Delegate Agencies in the PIR Data Set

BY REGION	NUMBER OF GRANTEES/DELEGATE AGENCIES IN THE SAMPLE BASED ON 1992 PIR SUBMISSIONS	NUMBER OF GRANTEES/DELEGATE AGENCIES SUBMITTING PIR REPORTS IN 1993	PERCENTAGE* OF 1993 GRANTEES/DELEGATE AGENCIES INCLUDED IN THE SAMPLE	NUMBER OF GRANTEES/DELEGATE AGENCIES SUBMITTING PIR REPORTS IN 1994	PERCENTAGE* OF 1994 GRANTEES/DELEGATE AGENCIES INCLUDED IN THE SAMPLE
1	87	91	95.6	93	93.5
2	209	215	97.2	223	93.7
3	161	173	93.1	175	92.0
4	259	272	95.2	278	93.2
5	320	342	93.6	340	94.1
6	187	202	92.6	216	86.6
7	81	83	97.6	87	93.1
8	65	75	86.7	77	84.4
9	161	168	95.6	171	94.2
10	62	66	94.0	66	93.9
11	108	113	95.6	119	90.8
12	55	67	82.1	63	87.3
TOTAL	1755	1867	94.0	1908	92.0

BY AUSPICE	NUMBER OF GRANTEES/DELEGATE AGENCIES IN THE SAMPLE BASED ON 1992 PIR SUBMISSIONS	NUMBER OF GRANTEES/DELEGATE AGENCIES SUBMITTING PIR REPORTS IN 1993	PERCENTAGE OF 1993 GRANTEES/DELEGATE AGENCIES INCLUDED IN THE SAMPLE	NUMBER OF GRANTEES/DELEGATE AGENCIES SUBMITTING PIR REPORTS IN 1994	PERCENTAGE OF 1994 GRANTEES/DELEGATE AGENCIES INCLUDED IN THE SAMPLE
1	633	663	95.5	655	96.6
2	348	373	93.3	381	91.3
3	586	636	92.1	651	90.0
4	78	82	95.1	104	75.0
5	110	113	97.3	117	94.0
TOTAL	1755	1867	94.0	1908	92.0

* Grantees or delegate agencies excluded from the sample are either new agencies or agencies failing to submit PIR reports for all three years.

APPENDIX 3
Head Start Regions

Region 1	Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island
Region 2	New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands
Region 3	District of Columbia, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia
Region 4	Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee
Region 5	Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin, Illinois
Region 6	Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas.
Region 7	Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska
Region 8	Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming
Region 9	American Samoa, Arizona, California, Guam, Hawaii, Nevada, Trust Territories
Region 10	Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington
Region 11	Indian Programs Branch
Region 12	Migrant Programs Branch

REFERENCES

Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion (1993). *Creating A 21st Century Head Start: Final Report.* Washington, DC: Head Start Bureau, Administration on Children, Youth and Families.

Bellm, D. (1994). *Breaking the Link: A National Forum on Child Care Compensation.* Washington, DC: National Center for the Early Childhood Work Force.

Bellm, D. and Whitebook, M. (1991). What States Can Do To Secure A Skilled And Stable Child Care Work Force: Strategies To Use The New Federal Funds For Child Care Quality. Oakland, CA: National Center for the Early Childhood Work Force, formerly the Child Care Employee Project.

Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Ready to Learn: A Mandate for the Nation.* New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Learning

Brush, L., Gaidurgis, A., and Best, C. (1993). *Indices of Head Start Program Quality.* Washington, DC: Head Start Bureau, Administration on Children, Youth and Families.

Cost, Quality and Outcomes Team (1995). *Cost, Quality And Child Outcomes In Child Care Centers. Executive Summary.* Denver, CO: University of Colorado at Denver.

Mitchell, A. (1995). Personal communication based on research on Head Start Collaboration Projects.

Morin, J. (1993). *Taking Matters into their Own Hands: A Guide To Unionizing In The Child Care Field.* Oakland, CA: National Center for the Early Childhood Work Force, formerly the Child Care Employee Project.

National Head Start Association (1990). *Head Start Salaries: 1989-1990 Staff Salary Survey.* Alexandria, VA: National Head Start Association.

National Head Start Association (1990). *Head Start: The Nation's Pride, A Nation's Challenge: Recommendations For Head Start in 1990. The Report of The Silver Ribbon Panel.* Alexandria, VA: National Head Start Association.

National Head Start Association (1993). *Investing in Quality: The Impact of the Head Start Expansion and Improvement Act of 1990 in its First Year Of Implementation.* Alexandria, VA: National Head Start Association.

Phillips, D. and Whitebook, M. (1986). "Who are the Child Care Workers? The Search for the Answers," *Young Children*, May 1986. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Schweinhart, L., Barnes, H. and Weikart, D. (1993). *Significant Benefits: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study Through Age 27*. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation.

United States General Accounting Office (1994). *Early Childhood Programs. Local Perspectives on Barriers to Providing Head Start Services*. Washington, DC: United States General Accounting Office (GAO/HEHS-95-8).

United States Congress (1990). Head Start Expansion and Quality Improvement Act.

Whitebook, M. and Sakai, L. (1995). *The Potential of Mentoring: An Assessment of the California Early Childhood Mentor Teacher Program*. Washington, DC: National Center for the Early Childhood Work Force.

Whitebook, M., Howes, C. and Phillips, D. (1990). *The National Child Care Staffing Study: Who Cares? Child Care Teachers and the Quality of Care in America. Final Report*. Oakland, CA: National Center for the Early Childhood Work Force, formerly the Child Care Employee Project. Dedication:

The National Center for the Early Childhood Work Force (NCECW), formerly the Child Care Employee Project, is a policy, research and advocacy organization dedicated to enhancing the compensation, working conditions and training of child care staff and providers. In 1989, NCECW published the benchmark study on child care compensation and its role in child care quality, *The National Child Care Staffing Study* (updated in 1993). Since then, NCECW has published numerous studies relating to child care staffing and quality. NCECW coordinates the National Worthy Wage Campaign, a grassroots mobilization of caregivers, parents and others working to confront and reverse the child care staffing crisis. Additionally, NCECW coordinates the Early Childhood Mentoring Alliance, a network of early childhood professionals working to enhance career development, compensation and leadership among child care teachers and providers.

■

National Center for the Early Childhood Work Force

733 15th St. NW
Suite 1037
Washington, DC
20005-2112
202-737-7700